# BOHNENBLUST–HILLE AND HARDY–LITTLEWOOD INEQUALITIES BY BLOCKS

N. ALBUQUERQUE, G. ARAÚJO, D. NÚÑEZ-ALARCÓN, D. PELLEGRINO, AND P. RUEDA

Abstract. Results related to summability of multilinear operators dates back, at least, to the 30's, with Littlewood's 4/3 inequality. Since then, several different related results and approaches have appeared, for instance with the Bohnenblust–Hille (*Annals of Math.*, 1931) and Hardy–Littlewood (*Quarterly J. Math*, 1934) inequalities and its striking (and very recent) applications in different fields of Mathematics and Physics. In this paper we present a new unifying approach to a series of results on summability of multilinear forms.

arXiv:1409.6769v6 [math.FA] 26 Oct 2015

## 1. Introduction

Let $\mathbb{K}$ be $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$, $1 \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq p_1, ..., p_m \leq \infty$. From now on, for $\mathbf{p} := (p_1, \ldots, p_m) \in [1, +\infty]^m$, let

$$\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| := \frac{1}{p_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_m},$$

$X_p := \ell_p$, for $1 \leq p < \infty$, and $X_\infty := c_0$. The following results on summability of $m$-linear forms $T : X_{p_1} \times \cdots \times X_{p_m} \to \mathbb{K}$ are well known.

- Zalduendo ([17], 1993): Let $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| < 1$. For every continuous $m$-linear form $T : X_{p_1} \times \cdots \times X_{p_m} \to \mathbb{K}$,

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |T(e_i, ..., e_i)|^{\frac{1}{1-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}}\right)^{1-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|} \leq \|T\| \tag{1.1}$$

- Aron and Globevnik ([6], 1989): For every continuous $m$-linear form $T : c_0 \times \cdots \times c_0 \to \mathbb{K}$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |T(e_i, \ldots, e_i)| \leq \|T\|. \tag{1.2}$$

- Hardy–Littlewood [12] and Dimant–Sevilla-Peris [11] (1934 and 2013): Let $m \geq 1$ and $\frac{1}{2} \leq \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| < 1$. Then there is a (optimal) constant $D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p}} \geq 1$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_m=1}^{\infty} |T(e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_m})|^{\frac{1}{1-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}}\right)^{1-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|} \leq D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p}} \|T\| \tag{1.3}$$

  for every continuous $m$-linear operator $T : X_{p_1} \times \cdots \times X_{p_m} \to \mathbb{K}$.
- Hardy–Littlewood [12] and Praciano-Pereira [15] (1934 and 1981): Let $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. There exists a (optimal) constant $C^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,p} \geq 1$ such that, for every continuous $m$-linear form $T : X_{p_1} \times \cdots \times X_{p_m} \to \mathbb{K}$,

$$\left(\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_m=1}^{\infty} |T(e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_m})|^{\frac{2m}{m+1-2\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}}\right)^{\frac{m+1-2\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}{2m}} \leq C^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,p} \|T\|. \tag{1.4}$$

When $p_1 = \cdots = p_m = p = \infty$, since $\frac{2mp}{mp+p-2m} = \frac{2m}{m+1}$, we recover the classical Bohnenblust–Hille inequality (see [8]):

- Bohnenblust–Hille inequality ([8], 1931): There exists a (optimal) constant $C^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\infty} \geq 1$ such that, for every continuous $m$–linear form $T : c_0 \times \cdots \times c_0 \to \mathbb{K}$,

$$\left(\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_m=1}^{\infty} |T(e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_m})|^{\frac{2m}{m+1}}\right)^{\frac{m+1}{2m}} \leq C^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\infty} \|T\|. \tag{1.5}$$

*Key words and phrases.* Absolutely summing operators; Bohnenblust–Hille inequality; Hardy–Littlewood inequality.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): Primary 47A63; Secondary 47H60.

N. Albuquerque is supported by Capes; G.Araújo, D. Pellegrino are supported by CNPq Grant 401735/2013-3 - PVE - Linha 2; P. Rueda is supported by Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad (Spain) MTM2011-22417.

All exponents involved in the previous inequalities are sharp. Very recently an extended version of the Hardy–Littlewood inequality/Praciano-Pereira was presented in [1]:

- Albuquerque et al. ([1], 2014) Let $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Let also $\mathbf{q} := (q_1, \ldots, q_m) \in \left[\left(1 - \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|\right)^{-1}, 2\right]^m$. There is a (optimal) constant $C^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}} \geq 1$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty}\left(\cdots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{\infty}\left|A\left(e_{i_1},\ldots,e_{i_m}\right)\right|^{q_m}\right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}}\cdots\right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}}\left\|A\right\| \tag{1.6}$$

for every continuous $m$-linear form $A : X_{p_1} \times \cdots \times X_{p_m} \to \mathbb{K}$ if, and only if,

$$\frac{1}{q_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{q_m} \leq \frac{m+1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|.$$

Note that from (1.6):

(a) If $p_1 = \cdots = p_m = \infty$ and $q_1 = \cdots = q_m = \frac{2m}{m+1}$ we recover the classical Bohnenblust–Hille inequality;

(b) If $q_1 = \cdots = q_m = \frac{2m}{m+1-2\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}$ we recover the Hardy–Littlewood/Praciano-Pereira inequality and we will denote $C^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p},\left(\frac{2m}{m+1-2|1/\mathbf{p}|},\ldots,\frac{2m}{m+1-2|1/\mathbf{p}|}\right)}$ by $C^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p}}$. Moreover, if $p_1 = \cdots = p_m = p$ we will denote $C^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p}}$ by $C^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,p}$.

For more details we refer to [1, 2, 4, 9, 12, 15]. From now on, if $n_1, \ldots, n_k \geq 1$ are such that $n_1 + \cdots + n_k = m$, then $\left(e^{n_1}_{i_1}, \ldots, e^{n_k}_{i_k}\right)$ will mean

$$(e_{i_1}, \overset{n_1 \text{times}}{\ldots}, e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_k}, \overset{n_k \text{times}}{\ldots}, e_{i_k}).$$

Our main goal in this paper is to unify (1.1), (1.2), (1.3), (1.4), (1.5) and (1.6) in a unique and more general theorem. More precisely, we investigate what happens when some of the indices of the sums $i_1, \ldots, i_m$ are repeated. Our general result (see Theorem 2.4) yields the following particular case whenever $p_1 = \cdots = p_m = p$, which has a more friendly statement.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let $m \geq k \geq 1$, $m < p \leq \infty$ and let $n_1, \ldots, n_k \geq 1$ be such that $n_1 + \cdots + n_k = m$. Then, for every continuous $m$–linear form $T : \ell_p \times \cdots \times \ell_p \to \mathbb{K}$, there is a constant $M(k, m, p, \mathbb{K}) \geq 1$ such that*

$$\left(\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_k=1}^{\infty}\left|T\left(e^{n_1}_{i_1},\ldots,e^{n_k}_{i_k}\right)\right|^{\rho}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \leq M(k,m,p,\mathbb{K})\left\|T\right\|,$$

*with*

$$\rho = \frac{p}{p-m} \text{ for } m < p \leq 2m \text{ and } M(k,m,p,\mathbb{K}) \leq C^{\mathbb{K}}_{k,p}$$

*and*

$$\rho = \frac{2kp}{kp+p-2m} \text{ for } p \geq 2m \text{ and } M(k,m,p,\mathbb{K}) \leq D^{\mathbb{K}}_{k,p}. \tag{1.7}$$

*Moreover, in both cases, the exponent $\rho$ is optimal.*

**Remark 1.2.** *It is very interesting to stress that the optimal exponent for the case $p \geq 2m$ is not the exponent of the $k$-linear case, as one may expect. It is a kind of surprising combination of the cases of $k$-linear and $m$-linear forms, as it can be seen in (1.7).*

The best known estimates for the constants $C^{\mathbb{K}}_{k,\infty}$ ($C^{\mathbb{K}}_{1,\infty} = 1$ is obvious) which were recently presented in [7], are

$$\begin{aligned}
C^{\mathbb{C}}_{k,\infty} &\leq \prod_{j=2}^{k}\Gamma\left(2-\frac{1}{j}\right)^{\frac{j}{2-2j}}, \\
C^{\mathbb{R}}_{k,\infty} &\leq 2^{\frac{446381}{55440}-\frac{k}{2}}\prod_{j=14}^{k}\left(\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{3}{2}-\frac{1}{j}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi}}\right)^{\frac{j}{2-2j}}, \quad \text{for } k \geq 14, \\
C^{\mathbb{R}}_{k,\infty} &\leq \left(\sqrt{2}\right)^{\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\frac{1}{j}}, \quad \text{for } 2 \leq k \leq 13.
\end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

In a more simplified formulation the above formulas tell us that the growth of the constants $C_{k,\infty}^{\mathbb{K}}$ is sublinear since, from the above estimates, it can be proved that (see [3, 7])

$$C_{k,\infty}^{\mathbb{C}} < k^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}} < k^{0.21139},$$

$$C_{k,\infty}^{\mathbb{R}} < 1.3 \times k^{\frac{2-\log 2-\gamma}{2}} < 1.3 \times k^{0.36482},$$

where $\gamma$ denotes the Euler–Mascheroni constant.

In the next section we present a unified (and sharp) version of the Bohnenblust–Hille and the Hardy–Littlewood inequalities allowing partial sums (i.e., sums over less indices are allowed).

Throughout this paper, $E, E_1, E_2, \ldots, F, F_1, F_2, \ldots$ shall denote Banach spaces and $\mathcal{L}(E_1, \ldots, E_m; F)$ stands for the Banach space of all bounded $m$-linear operators from $E_1 \times \cdots \times E_m$ to $F$ endowed with the sup norm. The topological dual of $E$ shall be denoted by $E^*$ and for any $p \geq 1$ its conjugate is represented by $p^*$, i.e., $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p^*} = 1$. For $p \in [1, \infty]$, as usual, we consider the Banach spaces of weakly, strongly $p$-summable sequences, respectively:

$$\ell_p^w(E) := \left\{ (x_j)_{j=1}^\infty \subset E : \left\|(x_j)_{j=1}^\infty\right\|_{w,p} := \sup_{\varphi \in B_{E^*}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^\infty |\varphi(x_j)|^p \right)^{1/p} < \infty \right\}$$

and

$$\ell_p(E) := \left\{ (x_j)_{j=1}^\infty \subset E : \left\|(x_j)_{j=1}^\infty\right\|_{p} := \left( \sum_{j=1}^\infty \|x_j\|^p \right)^{1/p} < \infty \right\}.$$

(naturally, the sum $\sum$ should be replaced by the supremum if $p = \infty$).

## 2. Bohnenblust–Hille and Hardy–Littlewood block inequalities

Besides motivating the introduction of a new approach to the theory of summability of multilinear operators, the main purpose of this section is to present a unified version of the Bohnenblust–Hille and the Hardy–Littlewood inequalities with partial sums (i.e., we shall consider sums allowed to run over less indices) which also encompasses Zalduendo's and Aron–Globevnik's inequalities. A tensorial perspective will present an important role on this matter, establishing an intrinsic relationship between the exponents and constants involved and the number of indices taken on the sums.

The product $\hat{\otimes}^\pi_{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}} E_j = E_1 \hat{\otimes}^\pi \cdots \hat{\otimes}^\pi E_n$ denotes the completed projective $n$-fold tensor product of $E_1, \ldots, E_n$. The tensor $x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_n$ is denoted for short by $\otimes_{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}} x_j$, whereas $\otimes_n x$ denotes the tensor $x \otimes \cdots \otimes x$. In a similar way, $\times_{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}} E_j$ denotes the product space $E_1 \times \cdots \times E_n$.

Recall that $X_p = \ell_p$ if $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $X_p = c_0$ if $p = \infty$. Let $n$ be a positive integer and $1 \leq p_1, \ldots, p_n \leq \infty$ be such that $\frac{1}{p_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_n} < 1$. From now on in this section $r, s$ are defined by $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_n}$ and $\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{r} = 1$. Let $D_r \subset X_{p_1} \hat{\otimes}^\pi \cdots \hat{\otimes}^\pi X_{p_n}$ be the linear span of the tensors $\otimes_n e_i$ and $\overline{D}_r$ be its closure. The following lemma, although known (see [5]), is the key of Theorem 2.4 and so, we give a constructive proof inspired in [16, Example 2.23(b)].

**Lemma 2.1.** *The map $u_r : X_r \to \overline{D_r}$, given by $u_r(\sum_{i=1}^\infty a_i e_i) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty a_i \otimes_n e_i$, is an isometric isomorphism onto.*

*Proof.* For the sake of simplicity we will show only the case $1 \leq p_1, \ldots, p_n < \infty$. In all the other cases, that is, when one or more $X_i$'s are $c_0$, the proof can be easily adapted.

Let $\theta = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \otimes_n e_i$. Using the orthogonality of the Rademacher system, we get

$$\theta = \int_{[0,1]^{n-1}} \otimes_{j=1}^{n-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^k |a_i|^{\frac{r}{p_j}} r_i(t_j) e_i \right) \otimes \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \mathrm{sgn}(a_i) |a_i|^{\frac{r}{p_n}} r_i(t_1) \cdots r_i(t_{n-1}) e_i \right) dt_1 \ldots dt_{n-1},$$

where $r_i$ are the Rademacher functions. Hence,

$$\pi(\theta) \leq \sup_{\substack{0\leq t_j \leq 1 \\ 1\leq j\leq n-1}} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k |a_i|^{\frac{r}{p_j}} r_i(t_j) e_i \right\|_{p_j} \right] \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k r_i(t_1) \cdots r_i(t_{m-1}) \mathrm{sgn}(a_i) |a_i|^{\frac{r}{p_n}} e_i \right\|_{p_n} = \|(a_i)_{i=1}^k\|_r.$$

To prove $\|(a_i)_{i=1}^k\|_r \leq \pi(\theta)$, consider the $n$–linear form on $\ell_{p_1} \times \cdots \times \ell_{p_n}$ given by

$$B(x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(n)}) := \sum_{i=1}^k b_i x_i^{(1)} \cdots x_i^{(n)}$$

where $b_i = \operatorname{sgn}(a_i)\frac{|a_i|^{\frac{r}{s}}}{\|(a_i)_{i=1}^k\|_r^{\frac{r}{s}}}$. By Hölder's inequality,

$$\|B\| = \sup_{\substack{x^{(j)}\in B_{\ell_{p_j}}\\ 1\leq j\leq n}} \left|\sum_{i=1}^k b_i x_i^{(1)}\cdots x_i^{(n)}\right| \leq \sup_{\substack{x^{(j)}\in B_{\ell_{p_j}}\\ 1\leq j\leq n}} \|(b_i)_{i=1}^k\|_s \|x^{(1)}\|_{p_1}\cdots\|x^{(n)}\|_{p_n} = 1.$$

Therefore,

$$\pi(\theta) \geq |\langle\theta, B\rangle| = \left|\sum_{i=1}^k a_i B(e_i,\ldots,e_i)\right| = \left|\sum_{i=1}^k a_i b_i\right| = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k |a_i|^r\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}$$

and thus $\pi(\theta) = \|(a_i)_{i=1}^k\|_r$. By extending the isometric isomorphism to the completions, we get that $\overline{D_r}$ is isometrically isomorphic to $\ell_r$. □

Using the isometry between $\overline{D_r}$ and $\ell_r$ provided in the preceding lemma, we get:

**Lemma 2.2.** *The sequence $(\otimes_n e_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ belongs to $\ell_s^w\left(X_{p_1}\widehat{\otimes}^\pi\cdots\widehat{\otimes}^\pi X_{p_n}\right)$ and $\left\|(\otimes_n e_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\right\|_{w,s} = 1$.*

*Proof.* Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|(\otimes_n e_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\right\|_{w,s} &= \sup_{\varphi\in B_{(X_{p_1}\widehat{\otimes}^\pi\cdots\widehat{\otimes}^\pi X_{p_n})^*}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^\infty |\varphi(\otimes_n e_i)|^s\right)^{\frac{1}{s}} = \sup_{\varphi\in B_{(\overline{D_r})^*}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^\infty |\varphi(\otimes_n e_i)|^s\right)^{\frac{1}{s}}\\ &= \sup_{\varphi\in B_{\ell_s}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^\infty |\varphi(e_i)|^s\right)^{\frac{1}{s}} = 1.\end{aligned}$$

□

The following result is a kind of $k$-"linearization" of a given $m$-linear operator and will be used in the proof of our main result. Here and in some subsequent sections, we will use the following notation: for Banach spaces $E_1,\ldots,E_m$ and an element $x\in E_j$, for some $j\in\{1,\ldots,m\}$, the symbol $x_j\cdot e_j$ represents the vector $x_j\cdot e_j\in E_1\times\cdots\times E_m$ such that its $j$-th coordinate is $x_j\in E_j$, and 0 otherwise.

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let $m$ be a positive integer and let $E_1,\ldots,E_m,F$ be Banach spaces. Let $1\leq k\leq m$ and $I_1,\ldots,I_k$ be pairwise disjoint non-void subsets of $\{1,\ldots,m\}$ such that $\cup_{j=1}^k I_j = \{1,\ldots,m\}$. Then given $T\in\mathcal{L}(E_1,\ldots,E_m;F)$, there is a unique $\widehat{T}\in\mathcal{L}(\hat{\otimes}_{j\in I_1}^\pi E_j,\ldots,\hat{\otimes}_{j\in I_k}^\pi E_j;F)$ such that*

$$\widehat{T}(\otimes_{j\in I_1}x_j,\ldots,\otimes_{j\in I_k}x_j) = T(x_1,\ldots,x_m)$$

*and $\|\widehat{T}\| = \|T\|$. The correspondence $T\leftrightarrow\widehat{T}$ determines an isometric isomorphism between the spaces $\mathcal{L}(E_1,\ldots,E_m;F)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\hat{\otimes}_{j\in I_1}^\pi E_j,\ldots,\hat{\otimes}_{j\in I_k}^\pi E_j;F)$.*

*Proof.* We will proceed by transfinite induction on $m$. Note that for $m=1$ or $m=2$ there is nothing to be proved ($\widehat{T}$ is just the linearization of $T$ whenever $m=2$ and $k=1$). Assume that the result is true for any positive integer less than $m$ and let $T\in\mathcal{L}(E_1,\ldots,E_m;F)$ and $I_1,\ldots,I_k$ as in the statement. Assume that $|I_k| = m_k$ and fix $x_j\in E_j$, for any $j\in I_k$. Fix $\sum_{j\in I_k}x_j\cdot e_j\in\times_{j\in I_k}E_j$. Consider the continuous $(m-m_k)$-linear mapping given by

$$T_{\left(\sum_{j\in I_k}x_j\cdot e_j\right)}\left(\sum_{i\in I_1}x_i\cdot e_i+\cdots+\sum_{i\in I_{k-1}}x_i\cdot e_i\right) := T(x_1,\ldots,x_m).$$

By the induction hypothesis, there exists a unique $\widetilde{T}\left(\sum_{j\in I_k}x_j\cdot e_j\right)\in\mathcal{L}(\hat{\otimes}_{j\in I_1}^\pi E_j,\ldots,\hat{\otimes}_{j\in I_{k-1}}^\pi E_j;F)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{T}\left(\sum_{j\in I_k}x_j\cdot e_j\right)(\otimes_{i\in I_1}x_i,\ldots,\otimes_{i\in I_{k-1}}x_i) &= T_{\left(\sum_{j\in I_k}x_j\cdot e_j\right)}\left(\sum_{i\in I_1}x_i\cdot e_i+\cdots+\sum_{i\in I_{k-1}}x_i\cdot e_i\right)\\ &= T(x_1,\ldots,x_m)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left\|\widetilde{T}\left(\sum_{j\in I_k}x_j\cdot e_j\right)\right\| = \left\|T_{\left(\sum_{j\in I_k}x_j\cdot e_j\right)}\right\|.$$

Define now the $m_k$-linear mapping $A:\times_{j\in I_k}E_j\to\mathcal{L}\left(\hat{\otimes}_{j\in I_1}^\pi E_j,\ldots,\hat{\otimes}_{j\in I_{k-1}}^\pi E_j;F\right)$ given by

$$A\left(\sum_{i\in I_k}y_i\cdot e_i\right) := \widetilde{T}\left(\sum_{i\in I_k}y_i\cdot e_i\right)$$

and let $A_L \in \mathcal{L}\left(\hat{\otimes}^{\pi}_{j\in I_k} E_j; \mathcal{L}\left(\hat{\otimes}^{\pi}_{j\in I_1} E_j, \ldots, \hat{\otimes}^{\pi}_{j\in I_{k-1}} E_j; F\right)\right)$ its linearization, i.e., the unique linear map from $\hat{\otimes}^{\pi}_{j\in I_k} E_j$ into $\mathcal{L}(\hat{\otimes}^{\pi}_{j\in I_1} E_j, \ldots, \hat{\otimes}^{\pi}_{j\in I_{k-1}} E_j; F)$ such that $A_L\left(\otimes_{j\in I_k} y_j\right) = A\left(\sum_{j\in I_k} y_j \cdot e_j\right)$. Finally, $\widehat{T} : \hat{\otimes}^{\pi}_{j\in I_1} E_j \times \cdots \times \hat{\otimes}^{\pi}_{j\in I_k} E_j \to F$ defined by

$$\widehat{T}(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k) := A_L(\theta_k)(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{k-1})$$

is $k$-linear, continuous, and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{T}(\otimes_{j\in I_1} x_j, \ldots, \otimes_{j\in I_k} x_j) &= A_L\left(\otimes_{j\in I_k} x_j\right)\left(\otimes_{j\in I_1} x_j, \ldots, \otimes_{j\in I_{k-1}} x_j\right)\\ &= \widetilde{T}\left(\sum_{i\in I_k} y_i \cdot e_i\right)\left(\otimes_{j\in I_1} x_j, \ldots, \otimes_{j\in I_{k-1}} x_j\right)\\ &= T(x_1, \ldots, x_m)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widehat{T}\| &= \sup_{\substack{\theta_j \in B_{\hat{\otimes}^{\pi}_{i\in I_j} E_i}\\ j=1,\ldots,k}} \|A_L(\theta_k)(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{k-1})\|\\ &= \|A_L\| = \|A\| = \sup_{\substack{y_i \in E_i\\ i\in I_k}} \left\|\tilde{T}\left(\sum_{i\in I_k} y_i \cdot e_i\right)\right\| = \sup_{\substack{y_i \in E_k\\ i\in I_k}} \left\|T_{\left(\sum_{i\in I_k} y_i \cdot e_i\right)}\right\| = \|T\|.\end{aligned}$$

□

Now we prove our main result, which encompasses (1.1), (1.2), (1.3), (1.4),(1.5) and (1.6).

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let $1 \le k \le m$ and $n_1, \ldots, n_k \ge 1$ be positive integers such that $n_1 + \cdots + n_k = m$ and assume that*

$$\mathbf{p} := \left(p_1^{(1)}, \overset{n_1 \text{ times}}{\ldots}, p_{n_1}^{(1)}, \ldots, p_1^{(k)}, \overset{n_k \text{ times}}{\ldots}, p_{n_k}^{(k)}\right) \in [1, \infty]^m$$

*is such that $0 \le \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| < 1$. Let $r_i$ given by $\frac{1}{r_i} = \frac{1}{p_1^{(i)}} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_{n_i}^{(i)}}$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$.*

(1) *If $0 \le \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| \le \frac{1}{2}$ and $\mathbf{q} := (q_1, \ldots, q_k) \in \left[\left(1 - \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|\right)^{-1}, 2\right]^k$ then, for every continuous $m$–linear form $T : \left(\times_{1\le i\le n_1} X_{p_i^{(1)}}\right) \times \cdots \times \left(\times_{1\le i\le n_k} X_{p_i^{(k)}}\right) \to \mathbb{K}$,*

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty}\left(\ldots\left(\sum_{i_k=1}^{\infty}\left|T\left(e_{i_1}^{n_1}, \ldots, e_{i_k}^{n_k}\right)\right|^{q_k}\right)^{\frac{q_{k-1}}{q_k}}\ldots\right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \le C^{\mathbb{K}}_{k,(r_1,\ldots,r_k),\mathbf{q}} \|T\| \tag{2.1}$$

*if and only if $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}}\right| \le \frac{k+1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|$. In other words, the exponents are optimal.*

(2) *If $\frac{1}{2} \le \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| < 1$ then, for every continuous $m$–linear form $T : \left(\times_{1\le i\le n_1} X_{p_i^{(1)}}\right) \times \cdots \times \left(\times_{1\le i\le n_k} X_{p_i^{(k)}}\right) \to \mathbb{K}$,*

$$\left(\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_k=1}^{\infty}\left|T\left(e_{i_1}^{n_1}, \ldots, e_{i_k}^{n_k}\right)\right|^{\frac{1}{1-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}}\right)^{1-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|} \le D^{\mathbb{K}}_{k,(r_1,\ldots,r_k)} \|T\|. \tag{2.2}$$

*Moreover, the exponent in (2.2) is optimal*

*Proof.* (1) Assume that $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}}\right| \le \frac{k+1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|$. We shall use the notation $(p_1^1), \ldots, p_{n_1}^{(1)}, \ldots, p_1^{(k)}, \ldots, p_{n_k}^{(k)}) = (p_1, \ldots, p_m)$. We take the $k$-linear mapping given in Proposition 2.3 $\widehat{T} : \widehat{\otimes}^{\pi}_{1\le i\le n_1} X_{p_i^{(1)}} \times \cdots \times \widehat{\otimes}^{\pi}_{1\le i\le n_k} X_{p_i^{(k)}} \to \mathbb{K}$ , that satisfies

$$\widehat{T}\left(\otimes_{1\le i\le n_1} x_i^{(1)}, \ldots, \otimes_{1\le i\le n_k} x_i^{(k)}\right) = T\left(x_1^{(1)}, \ldots, x_{n_1}^{(1)}, \ldots, x_1^{(k)}, \ldots, x_{n_k}^{(k)}\right).$$

Then,

$$\widehat{T}\left(\otimes_{n_1} e_{i_1}, \ldots, \otimes_{n_k} e_{i_k}\right) = T\left(e_{i_1}^{n_1}, \ldots, e_{i_k}^{n_k}\right),$$

and $\|\widehat{T}\| = \|T\|$. Thus

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty}\left(\dots\left(\sum_{i_k=1}^{\infty}\left|T\left(e_{i_1}^{n_1},\dots,e_{i_k}^{n_k}\right)\right|^{q_k}\right)^{\frac{q_{k-1}}{q_k}}\dots\right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}}$$

$$=\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty}\left(\dots\left(\sum_{i_k=1}^{\infty}\left|\widehat{T}\left(\otimes_{n_1}e_{i_1},\dots,\otimes_{n_k}e_{i_k}\right)\right|^{q_k}\right)^{\frac{q_{k-1}}{q_k}}\dots\right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}}.$$

For each $j=1,\dots,k$, we take $u_j : X_{r_j} \to \overline{D_{r_j}}$ defined by $u_j\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i e_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i \otimes_{n_j} e_i$. Lemma 2.2 will give

$$\|u_j\| = \left\|(\otimes_n e_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\right\|_{w,r_j^*} = 1.$$

Finally, it is sufficient to deal with the $k$-linear operator $S : X_{r_1}\times\cdots\times X_{r_k}\to\mathbb{K}$ defined by

$$S(z_1,\dots,z_k) := \widehat{T}\left(u_1(z_1),\dots,u_k(z_k)\right),$$

which is bounded and fulfills $\|S\| \le \|\widehat{T}\|$. Combining this with (1.6) and observing that

$$\frac{1}{r_1}+\cdots+\frac{1}{r_k} = \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|,$$

the result follows. To show that the inequalities (2.1) forces the exponent to be $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}}\right| \le \frac{k+1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|$, it suffices to prove by (1.6) that

$$\left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty}\left(\dots\left(\sum_{j_k=1}^{\infty}\left|A\left(e_{j_1},\dots,e_{j_k}\right)\right|^{q_k}\right)^{\frac{q_{k-1}}{q_k}}\dots\right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \le C^{\mathbb{K}}_{k,(r_1,\dots,r_k),\mathbf{q}}\|A\|$$

for all continuous $k$-linear forms $A : X_{r_1}\times\cdots\times X_{r_k}\to\mathbb{K}$ whenever (2.1) is fulfilled by all bounded $m$–linear forms $T : \left(\times_{1\le i\le n_1} X_{p_i^{(1)}}\right)\times\cdots\times\left(\times_{1\le i\le n_k} X_{p_i^{(k)}}\right)\to\mathbb{K}$. Let $A : X_{r_1}\times\cdots\times X_{r_k}\to\mathbb{K}$ be a bounded $k$-linear form. For each $i=1,\dots,k$ the diagonal space $\overline{D}_{r_i}$ is complemented in $X_{p_1^{(i)}}\hat{\otimes}^{\pi}\cdots\hat{\otimes}^{\pi}X_{p_{n_i}^{(i)}}$ (see [5]), and consider the diagonal projection $d_{r_i}$ from $X_{p_1^{(i)}}\hat{\otimes}^{\pi}\cdots\hat{\otimes}^{\pi}X_{p_{n_i}^{(i)}}$ onto $\overline{D}_{r_i}$, such that $d_{r_i}(\sum_{j_1,\dots,j_{n_i}} a_{(j_1,\dots,j_{n_i})}e_{j_1}\otimes\cdots\otimes e_{j_{n_i}})$ is equal to $\sum_{j_1,\dots,j_{n_i}} a_{(j_1,\dots,j_{n_i})}e_{j_1}\otimes\cdots\otimes e_{j_{n_i}}$ if $j_1=\cdots=j_{n_i}$ and to 0 otherwise. Define the $m$-linear map $T_A : X_{p_1}\times\cdots\times X_{p_m}\to\mathbb{K}$ by

$$T_A(x_1^{(1)},\dots,x_{n_1}^{(1)},\dots,x_1^{(k)},\dots,x_{n_k}^{(k)}) := A(u_{r_1}^{-1}\circ d_{r_1}(x_1^{(1)}\otimes\dots\otimes x_{n_1}^{(1)}),\dots,u_{r_k}^{-1}\circ d_{r_k}(x_1^{(k)}\otimes\dots\otimes x_{n_k}^{(k)})).$$

The following equalities give the result:

$$\begin{aligned} T_A(e_{i_1}^{n_1},\dots,e_{i_k}^{n_k}) &= A(u_{r_1}^{-1}\circ d_{r_1}(\otimes_{n_1}e_{i_1}),\dots,u_{r_k}^{-1}\circ d_{r_k}(\otimes_{n_k}e_{i_k})) \\ &= A(u_{r_1}^{-1}(\otimes_{n_1}e_{i_1}),\dots,u_{r_k}^{-1}(\otimes_{n_k}e_{i_k})) = A(e_{i_1},\dots,e_{i_k}). \end{aligned}$$

(2) The argument is similar to the one of the case $0\le\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|\le\frac{1}{2}$, we just need to use (1.3) instead of (1.6). □

An immediate and illustrative corollary is the case $p_1=\cdots=p_m=p$ which can be stated in a cleaner form (see Theorem 1.1). The following table summarizes the (optimal) exponents and respective best known constants that can be derived from our result combined with estimates from [3, 11, 14] (below $\gamma$ denotes the Euler-Mascheroni constant):

| | $m<p\le 2m$ | $2m<p\le 2m^3-4m^2+2m$ | $2m^3-4m^2+2m<p\le\infty$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| $\rho$ | $\frac{p}{p-m}$ | $\frac{2kp}{kp+p-2m}$ | $\frac{2kp}{kp+p-2m}$ |
| $M(k,m,p,\mathbb{R})$ | $\left(\sqrt{2}\right)^{k-1}$ | $1.3k^{\left(\frac{2-\log 2-\gamma}{2}\right)(k-1)\left(\frac{2k-p+kp-2k^2}{k^2p-2kp}\right)}\left(\sqrt{2}\right)^{\frac{p-2k-kp+2k^2-6k^3+2k^4}{kp(k-2)}}$ | $1.3k^{\frac{2-\log 2-\gamma}{2}}$ |
| $M(k,m,p,\mathbb{C})$ | $\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}\right)^{k-1}$ | $k^{\left(\frac{1-\gamma}{2}\right)(k-1)\left(\frac{2k-p+kp-2k^2}{k^2p-2kp}\right)}\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}\right)^{\frac{p-2k-kp+6k-6k^3+2k^4}{kp(k-2)}}$ | $k^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}$ |

For slightly worse but more friendly formulas for the case $p\ge 2m$ we refer to [4].

**Remark 2.5.** *Looking at the proof of Theorem 2.4 and choosing $k = 1$ and $n_1 = m$ we not only recover Zalduendo's result but we provide an alternative proof for it.*

**Remark 2.6.** *Our results motivate the following unifying notion of absolutely summing multilinear operators. Let $m, k$ be positive integers with $1 \leq k \leq m$, and $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) := (p_1, \ldots, p_m, q_1, \ldots, q_k) \in [1, \infty)^{m+k}$. Let also $\mathcal{I} = \{I_1, \ldots, I_k\}$ be a family of non-void disjoints subsets of $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ such that $\cup_{i=1}^{k} I_i = \{1, \ldots, m\}$, that is, $\mathcal{I}$ is a partition of $\{1, \ldots, m\}$. A multilinear operator $T : E_1 \times \cdots \times E_m \to F$ is $\mathcal{I}$–partially multiple $(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{p})$–summing if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\left( \sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \left( \cdots \left( \sum_{i_k=1}^{\infty} \left\| T\left( \sum_{n=1}^{k} \sum_{j \in I_n} x_{i_n}^{I_n} \cdot e_j \right) \right\|_F^{q_k} \right)^{\frac{q_{k-1}}{q_k}} \cdots \right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C \prod_{n=1}^{k} \prod_{l \in I_n} \left\| \left( x_{i_n}^{I_n} \right)_{i_n=1}^{\infty} \right\|_{w,p_l}.$$

*Let us represent the class of all $\mathcal{I}$–partially multiple $(\mathbf{q}; \mathbf{p})$–summing operators by $\Pi_{(\mathbf{q};\mathbf{p})}^{k,m,\mathcal{I}}(E_1, \ldots, E_m; F)$. The infimum taken over all possible constants $C > 0$ satisfying the previous inequality defines a norm for this space. It can be verified that under this norm $\Pi_{(\mathbf{q};\mathbf{p})}^{k,m,\mathcal{I}}(E_1, \ldots, E_m; F)$ is a Banach space. Note that when*

- $k = 1$, we recover the class of absolutely $(q; p_1, \ldots, p_m)$–summing operators;
- $k = m$ and $q_1 = \cdots = q_m =: q$, we recover the class of multiple $(q; p_1, \ldots, p_m)$–summing operators.

## References


[1] N. Albuquerque, F. Bayart, D. Pellegrino and J.B. Seoane-Sepúlveda, Sharp generalizations of the multilinear Bohnenblust–Hille inequality, J. Funct. Anal. **266** (2014), 3726–3740.

[2] N. Albuquerque, F. Bayart, D. Pellegrino and J.B. Seoane-Sepúlveda, Optimal Hardy–Littlewood type inequalities for polynomials and multilinear operators, Israel Journal of Mathematics, in press, arXiv:1311.3177.

[3] G. Araújo, D. Pellegrino, On the constants of the Bohnenblust–Hile and Hardy–Littlewood inequalities, arXiv:1407.7120v2 [math.FA] 6 Aug 2014.

[4] G. Araújo, D. Pellegrino, and D.D.P. Silva, On the upper bounds for the constants of the Hardy–Littlewood inequality, J. Funct. Anal. **267** (2014), 1878–1888.

[5] A. Arias, J. D. Farmer, On the structure of tensor products of $\ell_p$-spaces. Pacific J. Math. 175 (1996), 13–37.

[6] R.M. Aron, J. Globevnik, Analytic functions on $c_0$. Congress on Functional Analysis (Madrid, 1988). Rev. Mat. Univ. Complut. Madrid 2 (1989), suppl., 27–33.

[7] F. Bayart, D. Pellegrino, and J.B. Seoane-Sepúlveda, The Bohr radius of the $n$–dimensional polydisc is equivalent to $\sqrt{(\log n)/n}$, Advances in Math. **264** (2014) 726–746.

[8] H.F. Bohnenblust and E. Hille, On the absolute convergence of Dirichlet series, Ann. of Math. **32** (1931), 600–622.

[9] A. Defant, P. Sevilla-Peris, The Bohnenblust-Hille cycle of ideas from a modern point of view. Funct. Approx. Comment. Math. **50** (2014), no. 1, 55–127.

[10] J. Diestel, H. Jarchow, and A. Tonge, Absolutely summing operators, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[11] V. Dimant and P. Sevilla-Peris, Summation of coefficients of polynomials on $\ell_p$ spaces, arXiv:1309.6063v1 [math.FA] 24 Sep 2013.

[12] G. Hardy and J. E. Littlewood, Bilinear forms bounded in space $[p, q]$, Quart. J. Math. **5** (1934).

[13] A. Montanaro, Some applications of hypercontractive inequalities in quantum information theory, J. Math. Phys. 53, 122206, 2013.

[14] D. Pellegrino, A short communication on the constants of the multilinear Hardy–Littlewood inequality, arXiv:1510.00367.

[15] T. Praciano-Pereira, On bounded multilinear forms on a class of $\ell_p$ spaces. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **81** (1981), 561–568.

[16] R. Ryan, Introduction to tensor products, Springer Verlag, London, 2002.

[17] I. Zalduendo, An estimate for multilinear forms on $\ell_p$, Proc. Roy. Irish Acad. Sect. A 93 (1993), no. 1, 137–142



Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, 58.051-900 - João Pessoa, Brazil.
*E-mail address*: ngalbqrq@gmail.com

Departamento de Análisis Matemático, Facultad de Ciencias Matemáticas, Plaza de Ciencias 3, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, 28040, Spain
*E-mail address*: gdasaraujo@gmail.com

Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, 50.740-560 - Recife, Brazil.
*E-mail address*: danielnunezal@gmail.com

Departamento de Matemátic,a, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, 58.051-900 - João Pessoa, Brazil.
*E-mail address*: dmpellegrino@gmail.com and pellegrino@pq.cnpq.br

Departamento de Análisis Matemático, Universidad de Valencia, 46100 Burjassot, Valencia.
*E-mail address*: pilar.rueda@uv.es